EXHIBIT 42

XO6 UWY CV18-6046436-S SUPERIOR COURT

ERICA LAFFERTY, ET AL JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY

V AT WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

ALEX EMRIC JONES, ET AL NOVEMBER 15, 2021

XO6 UWY CV18-6046437-S SUPERIOR COURT

WILLIAM SHERLACH, ET AL JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY

V ERBURY, CONNECTICUT

ER 15, 2021

OR COURT

AL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY

V ERBURY, CONNECTICUT

ER 15, 2021

COURT'S RULING

B E F O R E:

THE HONORABLE BARBARA N. BELLIS, JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Representing the Plaintiffs:

ATTORNEY CHRISTOPHER MATTEI
ATTORNEY ALINOR STERLING
ATTORNEY MATTHEW BLUMENTHAL
Koskoff Koskoff & Bieder
350 Fairfield Avenue
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604

Representing the Defendants:

ATTORNEY JAY MARSHALL WOLMAN
Randazza Legal Group
100 Pearl Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

ATTORNEY CAMERON L. ATKINSON
Pattis & Smith
383 Orange Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

ATTORNEY MARIO CERAME
Brignole Bush & Lewis
73 Wadsworth Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Recorded and Transcribed By:
Patricia Sabol
Court Monitor
400 Grand Street
Waterbury, Connecticut 06702

THE COURT: All right. So I will order a copy of the transcript of the following ruling, and I will sign it and I will place it in the court file as my decision for the purposes of any appeal.

So I'll first address the Clinton deposition issue and the conduct of July 1, 2021. In the July 19, 2021 court filing by the defendants Infowars, LLC, Free Speech Systems, LLC, Infowars Health, LLC and Prison Planet, LLC, they described how in the motion to depose Hillary Clinton, testimony designated by the plaintiffs as highly confidential was filed in the Clinton deposition motion. They explained that this was done because in their opinion, the plaintiffs did not have a good-faith basis to designate the deposition as highly confidential before the deposition had commenced, despite the fact that the Jones defendants had previously done so themselves. And it is not lost on the Court that the highly confidential information was improperly filed in the middle of the first deposition of a plaintiff.

The July 19, 2021 filing is in sharp contrast to the Jones defendants' position at the October 20, 2021 sanctions hearing where the Court addressed what, if any, sanctions should enter. At the October 20 hearing, the Jones defendants claim they could publish confidential information as long as they did not reveal the name of the witness. That is, they argued

unconvincingly that they didn't understand the very protective order that they themselves drafted and asked the Court to approve as a Court order, which the Court did.

The position of the Jones defendants at the October 20, 2021 sanctions hearing did nothing but reinforce the Court's August 5th, 2021 order and findings that the cavalier actions on July 1st, 2021 constituted willful misconduct and violated the Court's clear and unambiguous protective order.

The history of the attorneys who have appeared for the defendants, Alex Jones, Infowars, LLC, Free Speech Systems, LLC, Infowars Health, LLC and Prison Planet TV, LLC is a convoluted one, even putting aside the motions to withdraw appearance, the claims of conflict of interest and the motions for stay advanced by these five defendants.

As the record reflects, on June 28, 2018, Attorney Wolman appeared for all five of the Jones defendants. Eight months later, on March 1st, 2019, Attorney Wolman is out of the case and Pattis & Smith filed an in-lieu-of appearance for all five defendants. On February 24, 2020, Attorney Latonica also appeared for all five defendants. Five months later on July 7, 2020, Attorney Latonica and Pattis & Smith is now out of the case and Attorney Wolman is back in the case for all five defendants. Then on

June 28, 2020, Pattis and Smith is back in the case, but now only appears for the four LLC defendants.

But what is perhaps more significant is the transparent attempt to cloud the issues by Pattis & Smith, for example, by listing the names of only three of the four clients they represent when filing the motion to take the deposition of Hillary Clinton and then listing all four clients in the July 19, 2021 filing relating to the issue. And by Attorney Wolman who then argued in his October 20, 2021 file that Infowars, LLC had no involvement in the motion for commission because their lawyer did not list their name on the motion. It is simply improper under our rules of practice for an attorney to do so.

Turning to the issue of the subsidiary ledgers. The five Jones defendants on November 6, 2020 filed with the Court their discovery objections relating to the deposition of Free Speech Systems' accounting manager and current employee, Melinda Flores. In response to the plaintiff's request for subsidiary ledgers, the Jones defendants objected on the basis that the production of the subsidiary ledgers was oppressive, unduly burdensome, disproportionate, harassing and that it will require digging through eight years of accounting. No objection was raised as to the term "subsidiary ledger", although parties frequently will object to a discovery request if they

consider it vague or confusing.

On April 29, 2021, the Court overruled the objection. On May 6, 2021, the Court ordered the deposition of Flores to take place on June 4, 2021 and ordered the documents to be produced by the close of business on May 14, 2021 stating that failure to comply may result in sanctions.

On May 14, 2021, the five Jones defendants responded to the document request and Court order and stating that the subsidiary ledgers were incorporated into the trial balances and had been produced.

At her June 4, 2021 deposition, Flores, the accounting manager, testified that subsidiary ledgers or detail was easily accessible and available to her. She testified that it would show the sources of advertising income and she testified repeatedly that Free Speech Systems maintained subsidiary ledger information. Flores did not believe she was obligated to produce the subsidiary ledgers, and it is unclear as to whether they have been produced.

It was impossible to reconcile the expert hired by Free Speech Systems with the November 6, 2020 objections filed with the Court and with Flores' deposition testimony. While the Jones defendants in their May 5th, 2021 motion state that Flores would be the best employee to identify and produce the requested documents and further state that Flores

would be compelled by Free Speech Systems to produce the requested documents at the deposition, the defendants hired expert, Mr. Roe, said that Flores was wrong and that Free Speech Systems doesn't use or have subsidiary ledgers.

The Court, in its August 6, 2021 order, found that the subsidiary ledger information was easily accessible by Flores by clicking on each general account, that, despite the Court orders and although the information exists and is maintained by Free Speech Systems and was required by the Court order to be produced, it had not been produced. And, again, it is still unclear as to what documents have been produced.

The Court rejected Roe's statements in his affidavit as not credible in light of the circumstances. The Court found that the plaintiffs were prejudiced in their ability to prosecute their claims and conduct further meaningful depositions and that sanctions would be addressed at a future hearing.

At the October, 2021 sanctions hearing, the Court addressed whether sanctions should enter. The Court finds that sanctions are, in fact, appropriate in light of the defendant's failure to fully and fairly comply with the plaintiff's discovery request and the Court's orders of April 29, 2021, May 6, 2021 and August 6, 2021.

Turning to the trial balances. In addition to objecting to the deposition of Flores, the Jones defendants, as I mentioned, filed discovery objections to the request for production directed to Flores. The Court ruled in favor of the defendants on one production request and ruled in favor of the plaintiffs with respect to others.

In addition to the subsidiary ledgers, the Court ordered production of the trial balances. Flores had run trial balances in the past unrelated to this action. Flores testified at her June 4, 2021 deposition that she personally accessed Quick Books and selected the option to generate trial balances for 2012 to 2019. She testified that she ran and printed them out and believed were produced. Her testimony the were produced was left uncorrected deposition.

The reports were not produced by the Court-ordered deadline of May 14, 2021. produced at her June 4, 2021 deposition, not been produced to date, despite their do so.

While the Jones defendants, in their May 5, 2021 Court filing, emphasized that Flores would be the best employee to identify and produce the requested documents which would include the trial balances and

that Flores would be compelled by Free Speech Systems to produce the documents at her deposition, not only were the reports not produced, but the Jones defendants in their October 7, 2021 filing now claim that Flores, a mere bookkeeper, provided flawed information to the defendants that the defendants, through Roe, had to correct. And the Court rejects that position.

The Jones defendants

records created by the Jones defendants' outside accountant were the records that were produced. But these records that removed accounts and consolidated accounts altered the information in the reports that their own accounting manager had produced, and they contain trial balances that did not balance. These sanitized, inaccurate records created by Roe were simply not responsive to the plaintiff's request or to the Court's order.

Turning to the analytics. The date for the parties to exchange written discovery has passed after numerous extensions by the Court. On May 14, 2021, the Court ordered that the defendants were obligated to fully and fairly comply with the plaintiff's earlier request for disclosure and production.

On June 1, 2021, the defendants filed an emergency motion for protective order apparently seeking protection from the Court's own order where the defendants again attempted to argue the scope of appropriate discovery.

The Court, on June 2, 2021, declined to do so and extended the deadline for final compliance to June 28, 2021 ordering the defendants to begin to comply immediately on a rolling basis. In its June 2nd order, the Court warned that failure to comply would result in sanctions including default.

With respect to analytics, including Google Analytics and social media Analytics, the defendants on May 7, 2019 represented that they had provided all the analytics that they had. They stated with respect to Google Analytics that they had access to Google Analytics reports, but did not regularly use them. As the Court previously set forth in its September 30, 2021 order, the defendants also claim that on June 17, 2019, they informally emailed zip files containing Google Analytics reports to the plaintiffs, but not the codefendants, an email the plaintiffs state they did not receive and that the Court found would not have been in compliance with our rules of practice.

On June 28, 2021, the Jones defendants filed a notice of compliance stating that complete final supplemental compliance was made by the defendants,

Alex Jones and Free Speech Systems, LLC and that Infowars, LLC, Infowars Health, LLC and Prison Planet, LLC, quote: Had previously produced all documents required to be produced, end quote, representing that with respect to the Google Analytics documents, Free Speech Systems, LLC could not export the dataset and that the only way they could comply was through the sandbox approach.

Then on August 8, 2021, the Jones defendants for the first time formally produced Excel spreadsheets limited to Google Analytics apparently for Infowars dot com and not for any of the other websites such as Prison Planet TV or Infowars Health. Importantly, the Jones defendants to date have still not produced any analytics data from any other platform such as Alexa, Comcast or Criteo.

The Jones defendants production of the social media analytics has similarly been insubstantial and similarly has fallen far short both procedurally and substantively, despite prior representations by the Jones defendants that they had produced the social media analytics and despite the May 25, 2021 deposition testimony of Louis Certucci, Free Speech Systems social media manager for nearly a decade, that there were no such documents.

At the June 28, 2021 deposition of Free Speech Systems corporate designee Zimmerman, Mr. Zimmerman

testified that, in fact, he had obtained some responsive documents from Certucci which were then loaded into a deposition chat room by counsel for the Jones defendants. It appears that these documents were minimal summaries or reports for Facebook and Twitter, but not for other platforms used by the defendants such as You Tube.

Any claim of the defendants that the failure to produce these documents was inadvertent falls flat as there was no evidence submitted to the Court that the defendants had a reasonable procedure in compile responsive materials within their power, possession or knowledge.

Months later, on October 8, 2021, the Jones defendants formally produced six documents for the spring of 2017 for Facebook containing similar information to the Zimmerman chat room documents, but not included in the chat room documents and screen shots of posts by Free Speech Systems to an unidentified social media account with no analytics.

The defendants represented that they had produced all the analytics when they had not done so. They represented in court filings that they did not rely on social media analytics and this, too, is false.

I'm going to need to take a thirty second water break, please.

(A short break in the proceedings occurred.)

This response was false. The plaintiffs in support of their motion for sanctions on the analytics issue attached as exhibit D, an email dated December 15, 2014 between former Free Speech Systems business manager Timothy Fruge and current Free Speech Systems employee Buckley Hamman. Fruge attaches annotated charts of detailed analytics concerning Jones' 2014 social media audience including gender demographics engagement and social media sites that refer people to Infowars dot com. As pointed out by the plaintiffs, Fruge's annotations are even more telling than the charts themselves and totally contradict the Jones defendants misrepresentations to the Court that, quote: There is no evidence to suggest that Mr. Jones or Free Speech Systems ever used these analytics to drive content, end quote.

The next image on the document shows key indicators on Twitter. Those are engagement and influence. Again, this is reading from Fruge's notes. Again, the next image shows the key indicators on Twitter. Those are engagement and influence. Notice our influence is great and our engagement is low. I bring this up -- again these are Fruge's notes -- because we should try and raise our engagement with our audience. Engagement is how well we are communicating and interacting with our audience. The higher our engagement, the more valuable our audience

will become to our business. And that is the end of Fruge's notes.

I would note that regardless of this reliance on social media analytics, the concept is simple. The defendants were ordered to produce the documents and our law requires them to produce information within their knowledge, possession or power. Discovery is not supposed to be a guessing game. What the Jones defendants have produced by way of analytics is not even remotely full and fair compliance required under our rules.

The Court finds that the Jones defendants have withheld analytics and information that is critical to the plaintiff's ability to conduct meaningful discovery and to prosecute their claims. This callous disregard of their obligations to fully and fairly comply with discovery and Court orders on its own merits a default against the Jones defendants.

Neither the Court nor the parties can expect perfection when it comes to the discovery process. What is required, however, and what all parties are entitled to is fundamental fairness that the other side produces that information which is within their knowledge, possession and power and that the other side meet its continuing duty to disclose additional or new material and amend prior compliance when it is incorrect.

Here the Jones defendants were not just careless. Their failure to produce critical documents, their disregard for the discovery process and procedure and for Court orders is a pattern of obstructive conduct that interferes with the ability of the plaintiffs to conduct meaningful discovery and prevents the plaintiffs from properly prosecuting their claims.

The Court held off on scheduling this sanctions hearing in the hopes that many of these problems would be corrected and that the Jones defendants would ultimately comply with their discovery obligations and numerous Court orders, and they have not.

In addressing the sanctions that should enter here, the Court is not punishing the defendants. The Court also recognizes that a sanction of default is one of last resort. This Court previously sanctioned the defendants not by entering a default, but by a lesser sanction, the preclusion of the defendant's special motions to dismiss. At this point entering other lesser sanctions such as monetary sanctions, the preclusion of evidence or the establishment of facts is inadequate given the scope and extent of the discovery material that the defendants have failed to produce.

As pointed out by the plaintiffs, they are attempting to conduct discovery on what the defendants publish and the defendants' revenue. And the failure

of the defendants to produce the analytics impacts the ability of the plaintiffs to address what is published and the defendants failure to produce the financial records such as sub-ledgers and trial balances affects the ability of the plaintiffs to address the defendants' revenue. The prejudice suffered by the plaintiffs, who had the right to conduct appropriate, meaningful discovery so they could prosecute their claims again, was caused by the Jones defendants willful noncompliance, that is, the Jones defendants failure to produce critical material information that the plaintiff needed to prove their claims.

For these reasons, the Court is entering a default against the defendants Alex Jones, Infowars, LLC, Free Speech Systems, LLC, Infowars Health, LLC and Prison Planet TV, LLC. The case will proceed as a hearing in damages as to the defendants. The Court notes Mr. Jones is sole controlling authority of all the defendants, and that the defendants filed motions and signed off on their discovery issues jointly. And all the defendants have failed to fully and fairly comply with their discovery obligations.

As I said, I will order a copy of the transcript. I will sign it and I will file it i Court as the Court's order.

Bellis, J

XO6 UWY CV18-6046436-S	SUPERIOR COURT.
ERICA LAFFERTY, ET AL	JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY
V	AT WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT
ALEX EMRIC JONES, ET AL	NOVEMBER 15, 2021
XO6 UWY CV18-6046437-S	SUPERIOR COURT
WILLIAM SHERLACH, ET AL	JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY
V	AT WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT
ALEX EMRIC JONES, ET AL	NOVEMBER 15, 2021
XO6 UWY CV18-6046438-S	SUPERIOR COURT
WILLIAM SHERLACH, ET AL	JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY
V	AT WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT
ALEX EMRIC JONES, ET AL	NOVEMBER 15, 2021

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I hereby certify the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription of the audio recording of the above-referenced case, heard in the Superior Court, Judicial District of Waterbury, at Waterbury, Connecticut, before the Honorable Barbara N. Bellis, Judge, on the 15th day of November, 2021.

Dated this 15th day of November, 2021, in Waterbury, Connecticut.

Patricia Sabol

Court Monitor